

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed May 5, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,394,843 (Chang, et al.) and rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,394,827 (Nogami). By the present amendment, claim 1 is amended and claims 1-6 are pending in this application.

As amended, applicants' invention is directed to a memory card connector that includes an insulating housing with a rear terminal-mounting section and at least one side wall section extending forwardly from one end of the rear section. The side wall section includes top and bottom surfaces. The top surface is configured for mounting on a circuit board and the top surface is opposite the bottom surface. An engaging projection on the top surface extends into an engaging opening in the cover plate of the metal shell of the memory card connector to prevent relative movement between the cover plate and the top surface. In addition, clearance is provided between the engaging projection and the engaging opening to avoid creating residual stresses in the housing.


The Examiner relies upon Chang, et al., to support the § 102(b) rejection stating that locking member 27 and locking hole 17 are the same as applicants' engaging projection and engaging opening. Applicants respectfully disagree. The top surface of applicants' claimed invention defines the bottom surface for mounting on a circuit board and the top surface being opposite the bottom surface. The locking member of Chang, et al., does not extend from a top surface that is opposite the bottom, board mounted, surface. Instead, the locking member 27 is more appropriately defined as extending from a side surface of the housing. In addition, the locking member 27 and locking hole 17 are configured to lock the shell in place and thus, likely create the type of stress that applicants are attempting to avoid. For the foregoing reasons, Chang, et al., does not show each and every element of applicants' claimed invention and thus cannot support the § 102(b) rejection. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) of claim 1. In addition, since claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, Chang, et al., cannot support a § 102(b) rejection of those claims either.

With respect the § 103(a) rejection of claim 6 based upon the combination of Chang, et al. and Nogami, applicants respectfully submit that Nogami does not cure the deficiencies of Chang, et al and thus cannot support such § 103(a) rejection. More specifically, the combination of Chang, et al. and Nogami does not teach, show or suggest applicants' claimed engaging projection on the top surface of the side wall section nor an engaging opening in the cover. Accordingly, the Examiner's reliance on the combination of Chang, et al. and Nogami to reject claim 6 is misplaced.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is patentable over each of the cited references and respectfully requests withdrawal of each of the rejections as well as the allowance of each of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conversation would facilitate the prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,  
MOLEX INCORPORATED

By:   
Charles S. Cohen  
Registration No. 32,210  
MOLEX INCORPORATED  
2222 Wellington Court  
Lisle, Illinois 60532  
Tel.: (630) 527-4660  
Fax.: (630) 416-4962

Date: November 6, 2006